Appln. No. 10/564, 349 Amdt. dated December 18, 2007 Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 21, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claim in the application is now claim 9, and this claim defines patentable subject matter warranting its allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-8 have been canceled in favor of new claim 9 which remains in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claims 2, 4 and 8 and rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, Applicant has canceled claims 1-8 in favor of new claim 9 which has been drafted to eliminate each of the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the claims and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, have now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fukumoto '949.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to new claim 9.

Appln. No. 10/564, 349 Amdt. dated December 18, 2007 Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

Applicant respectfully submits that Fukumoto '949 does not teach or show the structure as set out in new claim 9.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\O\Ohta\Fukumoto5\Pto\2007-12-18-Amendment.doc